

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

PAULETTE HOWARD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:05CV799 RWS
)	
AT&T,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

This matter is before me on plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.

Three factors are generally considered relevant in evaluating applications for appointment of counsel in Title VII cases: (1) the plaintiff's financial resources, (2) the plaintiff's efforts to secure counsel, and (3) the merits of the discrimination claim. Slaughter v. City of Maplewood, 731 F.2d 587, 590 (8th Cir. 1984).

After considering these factors and discussing scheduling issues with plaintiff during the Rule 16 conference, I do not believe that appointment of counsel is warranted at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel [#4] is denied.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rodney W. Sippe", written over a horizontal line.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 29th day of December, 2005.